

NELSON GOODMAN

MUCH ADO

Mr. Lincicome's treatment of what he considers to be a counterexample to my extensional isomorphism criterion for constructional definition incorporates elaborate technical apparatus and such dismaying counterfactual conditional locutions as "Pictorially speaking, it is as though there were something, x , such that...". All this is quite unnecessary since the case he constructs is no counterexample at all.

The class of the four shoebox pictures has four members as does the class of the four unicorn pictures; and the two classes are isomorphic to each other according to my criterion. Mr. Lincicome's denial of this isomorphism seems to depend upon identifying a shoebox picture or a unicorn picture with the class of things it depicts, a surprising mistake exactly parallel to confusing a predicate with the class of things it denotes.

Harvard University